REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1, 3, 4, 10 and 14 are amended. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges that the Final Office Action indicates that claims 7, 12, 13 and 15 are allowed.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 since the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration since the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution; and (c) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendments are necessary and were not earlier presented because they are made in response to arguments raised during the February 12, 2003 personal interview and in the final rejection. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies shown to Applicant's representative by Examiner Qi in the February 12, 2003 personal interview. Applicant's separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks. Specifically, claims 1, 3, 4 and 10 are amended to comply with the Examiner's helpful suggestions made during the interview.

I. The Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 1 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,767,827 to Kobayashi et al. ("Kobayashi") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,805,252 to Shimada et al. ("Shimada"), claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kobayashi and Shimada in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,056,895 to Kahn, claims 3, 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,510,918 to Matsunaga et al. ("Matsunaga") in view of Kahn, claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kobayashi in view of Matsunaga, claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

over Kobayashi and Matsunaga in view of Shimada, claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kobayashi and Matsunaga in view of Kahn, and claims 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Matsunaga in view of Kahn. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Kobayashi and Shimada do not disclose a liquid crystal panel substrate including "a silicon nitride film formed as an insulating interlayer between said reflecting electrodes and a metal layer above the switching element thereunder, wherein the metal layer shields incident light for preventing pixel switching," as recited in independent claim 1.

Instead, Kobayashi discloses a pixel electrode 9 that is formed to cover the pixel transistor and the auxiliary capacitance 10 to form an active matrix display panel of high aperture ratio. In addition, Kobayashi discloses a capacitance electrode 20, a data line 8 and drain electrode 23 that are covered by the pixel electrode 9. Thus, the capacitance electrode 20, data line 8 and drain electrode 23 do not shield incident light. Additionally, Shimada does not does not make up for the deficiencies of Kobayashi.

Matsunaga and Kahn do not disclose a liquid crystal panel substrate including "a passivation film having a laminate structure comprising a silicon oxide film and a silicon nitride film on said silicon oxide film, the passivation film being formed at least on a thickness side of the at least insulating layers," as recited in independent claim 3.

Instead, Matsunaga discloses a passivation film PSV1 that is formed to enclose the entirety of the matrix portion AR and is removed at its peripheral portion to expose the external connection terminals DTM and GTM to the outside and at the portion in which the common electrode COM at the side of the upper transparent glass substrate SUV2 is connected with the external connection terminal connecting leading line INT of the lower transparent glass substrate SUB1 by means of a silver paste AGP.

In addition, Kahn discloses a semiconductor substrate 40 covered by a thin silicon dioxide dielectric insulating layer 50. An additional oxide layer 53 covers th first oxide

layer. A capacitor substructure 64 is positioned on the oxide layer 53 and covered by insulating oxide layer 68. Thus, Kahn and Matsunaga do not disclose a passivation film being formed at least on a thickness side of the at least insulating layers, as recited in independent claims 3.

Kobayashi and Matsunaga do not disclose a liquid crystal panel substrate including "a second passivation film comprising a silicon nitride film formed at least on a thickness side of said periphery region," as recited in independent claim 4.

The Office Action admits that Kobayashi does not disclose a second passivation film comprising silicon nitride film formed on the periphery region, but asserts that Matsunaga makes-up for the deficiencies of Kobayashi. However, Matsunaga discloses a passivation film PSV1 is formed to enclose the entirety of the matrix portion AR and is removed at its peripheral portion to expose the external connection terminals DTM and GTM to the outside.

Matsunaga and Kahn do not disclose a liquid crystal panel substrate including "ascribed region formed on the periphery of the pixel region" and "a passivation film formed by a silicon nitride film and formed on a scribed region of said semiconductor substrate," as recited in independent claim 10.

As discussed above, Matsunaga discloses a passivation film PSV1 that terminates before the edge of the substrate SUB1. Additionally, Matsunaga and Kahn do not disclose that the passivation film is formed on a scribed region of the semiconductor substrate.

Kobayashi and Shimada do not disclose a liquid crystal panel substrate including "a silicon nitride film formed as an insulating layer between the second reflecting electrodes and the light shielding layer except for a connection portion between the reflecting electrodes and the switching element," as recited in independent claim 14.

Instead, Kobayashi discloses a capacitance electrode 20, data line 8 and drain electrode 23 connected to a pixel electrode 9. Additionally, Shimada does not make-up for the deficiencies of Kobayashi.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 should be withdrawn because the applied references, either in combination or alone, do not teach or suggest each feature of independent claims 1, 3, 4, 10 and 14. MPEP §2143.03 instructs that "[t]o establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claimed limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 409 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974)."

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 3, 4, 10 and 14 are patentable over the applied references. The remainder of the claims that depend from independent claims 1, 3, 4, 10 and 14 are likewise patentable over the applied references for at least the reasons discussed above, as well as for the additional features they recite.

II. Conclusion

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-15 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Jeffery M. Lillywhite
Registration No. 53,220

JAO:JML/can

Date: PROPOSED

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461